1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION	
3	IN RE: NATIONAL COLLEGIATE) Docket No. 13 C 9116
4	ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION STUDENT- ATHLETE CONCUSSION INJURY)) Chicago, Illinois) March 7, 2017
5	LITIGATION,) 1:00 o'clock p.m.
6	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - MOTION BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN Z. LEE	
7		NORABLE JOHN Z. LLL
8	APPEARANCES:	
9	For the Plaintiffs:	HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO, by MS. ELIZABETH A. FEGAN
10		455 North Cityfront Plaza Drive NBC Tower - Suite 2410 Chicago, Illinois 60611
11	For Plaintiff Whittier:	COATS ROSE YALE RYMAN & LEE, by
12	TOT FIATHLITE WHITELIET.	MR. DWIGHT E. JEFFERSON (appearing telephonically)
13		Nine Greenway Plaza Suite 1100
14		Houston, Texas 77046
15	For Plaintiff Nichols:	EDELSON PC, by MR. BENJAMIN SCOTT THOMASSEN
16		350 North LaSalle Street Suite 1300
17		Chicago, Illinois 60654
18	For Defendant NCAA:	LATHAM & WATKINS, by MS. JOHANNA MARGARET SPELLMAN
19		330 North Wabash Avenue Suite 2800
20		Chicago, Illinois 60611
21		
22		
23	ALEXANDRA ROTH, CSR, RPR Official Court Reporter	
24	219 South Dearborn Street, Room 1224 Chicago, Illinois 60604 (312) 408-5038	
25		
	II	

(Proceedings had in open court:)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

13 C 9116, NCAA Student Athlete Concussion THE CLERK: Injury Litigation.

MS. FEGAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Elizabeth Fegan for plaintiffs.

> Johanna Spellman for defendants. MS. SPELLMAN:

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Who do we have on the phone?

> MR. JEFFERSON: Dwight Jefferson, Judge.

> THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Jefferson.

MR. JEFFERSON: I just wanted to -- good morning.

THE COURT: Who else do we have on the phone? Anyone else? No? Okay.

MR. JEFFERSON: Just me, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. So we are here for status in There are a couple of things that the parties have this case. filed at my request. One is the response to my order requesting a supplemental status report regarding the additional notice program expenses.

In short, the parties indicate that based upon various developments, most significant of which is the additional robust addresses and e-mail information that they received from the various member institutions, that that along with other things have resulted in an estimated increase in the cost of notice program from the \$1.5 million that was set forth as part

of the motion for preliminary approval of the amended settlement, to now an estimate of \$2,135,380.21. I don't know how that's an estimate, but that's certainly the updated estimate, total estimate cost, of the notice program.

The parties submit that the increased cost is necessary and reasonable, and that the total cost of the notice program remains well within the reasonable range for notice program costs when compared to comparable settlements.

What I wanted to do today, and the reason why I wanted to have the parties appear for this status, is that I did want to enter an order providing anyone that cares to an opportunity to file any objections to the parties' request that the new estimate be deemed reasonable. And so I am going to give -- to the extent anyone has any objections to the response, I am going to give the parties, or anyone that wishes to, 14 days from today to file any objections to the request by the settling parties that the \$2.135 million for the updated total estimated cost of notice program is deemed reasonable.

I don't know whether we will receive anything. If we do, I will address it. And if we don't, I will go ahead and enter an order. And we will see what comes. We will see what comes up.

Also pending before the Court is a joint motion for extension of time. And this addresses the various deadlines that I had imposed as part of my order granting preliminary

approval of the class action settlement. The parties request additional time so that they can provide additional direct mail notice to a number of additional class members. My understanding is that approximately 78 NCAA member institutions have yet to provide settlement class member contact information.

I believe that comprises somewhere between around eight to ten percent of the overall member institutions, if I recall?

MS. SPELLMAN: That seems about right, your Honor.

THE COURT: But as I noted the last time that we were together, I do think that maximizing the direct notice program so that as many putative class members as possible can receive direct notice of the settlement is something that we should endeavor to accommodate. And so, therefore, I'm going to grant the request to reset dates.

But again, because of the size of this class, of the settlement class, I'm going to give anyone who wishes to 14 days to file any objections. Okay? But here are the revised dates. So I have reviewed the dates proposed by the parties. And at this point, the notice administrator plans to send out the second round of direct notice, based upon the new information that the parties received from the member institutions, on or before April 14.

Given that, I believe that setting May ${\bf 5}$ as the deadly

by which the settlement class members can object or opt out is too short of a timeframe, particularly if the last round of notice goes out April 14. People may not receive them until five, six, seven days later. And that leaves basically little bit over two weeks for them to evaluate their rights.

So as a result, I'm going to extend that date. So the deadline for settlement class members to object or opt out of the settlement will now be May 31.

Then the deadline for the notice administrator to file with the Court the opt-out list with an affidavit attesting to the completeness and accuracy thereof will be June 16. The notice administrator program administrator will file declarations to the Court concerning the implementation of the notice programs and other terms of the settlement by June 16.

The motion for final approval of the settlement, including responses to any objections that were raised, shall be filed by June 23. And the fairness hearing will be rescheduled to July 28.

Do you recall what time we set the fairness hearing for on June 29?

MS. FEGAN: Your Honor, I typically wouldn't ask to reschedule a fairness hearing. July 28 and 29 is our firm retreat. And I know Mr. Berman would very much like to be at both. If it's at all possible to pick either the 21st or August 4, if your Honor would prefer to have it on a Friday, we

1 would very much appreciate it. MR. JEFFERSON: Judge, that was scheduled at 10:00 2 3 a.m. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 4 5 MS. FEGAN: Or even earlier that week, your Honor. When is the retreat? 6 THE COURT: 7 It's the 28th and 29th, that Friday and MS. FEGAN: 8 Saturday. If it's not possible, we will make it work. 9 THE COURT: How about the 27th? 10 MS. FEGAN: That will be great. Thank you. 11 THE COURT: All right. We will set the final fairness 12 hearing for July 27, at 10:00 a.m. 13 MS. FEGAN: Thank you. 14 THE COURT: If you could send me a proposed order with 15 the revised dates, that would be great. And what I will do is, 16 I will revise that to state these are the dates that I propose 17 that we -- that I want to change it to. And again, if there 18 are any objections, I will give anyone that wishes to some time 19 to file any objections to those dates. I can't imagine there 20 will be any. Furthermore, with regard to that, as I noted, I do 21 22 think it's important to take steps to let the class members 23 know about the revised dates. So as a result, the parties have 24 suggested various steps that they will take to inform the class 25 of the revised dates, including e-mails as well as press

1 releases, changing the settlement class website to notify the 2 class of the revised dates. The revised dates will obviously 3 also be posted on the court's website as well. 4 And so the steps that the parties have proposed in the 5 joint motion for extension of time appear reasonable to me. 6 And so you can go ahead and do that once the 14 days has 7 lapsed. 8 MS. FEGAN: Okay. 9 THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else we need to address today? 10 11 MR. THOMASSEN: Your Honor, if I may. I'm sorry, I 12 didn't step up before. Ben Thomassen here for Mr. Nichols. 13 I just wanted to clarify, notice was sent out in the 14 motion that was filed with the Court. And your Honor also 15 addressed it through your prior order. But objections to the 16 fee briefs and petitions that have been filed, those would also 17 fall within the new objection deadline as well? 18 THE COURT: That's correct. 19 MR. THOMASSEN: Thanks, Judge. THE COURT: So the other question I want to --20 21 MR. JEFFERSON: The Court --THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. Jefferson. 22 23 So the other question that I wanted to talk to the 24 parties about is, so we have these member institutions, right, 25 78 member institutions, who haven't provided the class member

contact information yet. They have received subpoenas. 1 Have you been in contact with them? 2 3 With some of them, your Honor. MS. SPELLMAN: 4 THE COURT: And what about the ones that just simply 5 refused or have failed to provide any information? 6 MS. SPELLMAN: I have not -- to my knowledge, there have not been any that have just outright refused. 7 8 it's a matter of hopefully following up with them, perhaps 9 giving them some clarity on the scope of what the request is 10 since, you know, as worded it comes across as very broad, 11 potentially burdensome request. So that we are in discussions 12 with NCAA counsel about how best to do that. 13 But our intention is to reach out directly to them, to 14 try to really push them to provide what they are able to 15 provide by March 24. THE COURT: Okay. And to the extent that institutions 16 17 don't provide any information or refuse to provide information, 18 we talked about that little bit before. But how would that 19 impact the settlement vis-a-vis those institutions? MS. FEGAN: Your Honor, I don't think that it does. 20 21 Actually this is something I did go back and check the 22 settlement agreement. It doesn't mean that they are not 23 released. I think it just affects the notice program itself. 24 And given the very small numbers here, in talking to the notice 25 administrator, we don't think that it affects the overall

percentage reached that we thought we'd achieve, which we've already achieved even without them.

And so I think that what we are trying to do at this point is almost achieved to perfect. But I don't think it will affect either the notice program or ultimately the settlement itself if there are some number left at the end of the day.

THE COURT: If there are not, if there are schools that for one reason or another do not provide any information responsive to the subpoenas, at this point I am considering issuing notices for rule to show cause as to why they have not and requiring them to appear before me to explain to me why they are refusing to cooperate with a duly issued subpoena. So you might inform them of that as well.

I may also take the step of requesting that the parties file, so that everyone can see, a list of those member institutions that have not provided any information.

MR. JEFFERSON: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: So that if the subpoena is not incentive enough, perhaps public shaming on the docket would be. Okay?

Mr. Jefferson, did you want to bring anything up?

MR. JEFFERSON: Judge, only two things. I was going to ask, as you just indicated, if we can have identification of the 78 institutions that have not complied with the subpoenas. I think you -- you addressed that, Judge.

And the only other thing I had was regarding the

1 motion for extension of paragraph 12 and 13. You're not making 2 any changes to the dates that are proposed in that order? 3 You're going to sign an order with those dates? 4 THE COURT: No. Those dates I will change. 12 and 13 5 is what counsel was addressing, which is the deadline to 6 respond or object to the fee petitions, which is currently 7 March 10. I will go ahead and change those dates to May 31, to coincide with the dates for objections. 8 0kay? 9 With regard to the member institutions that have not 10 provided any response, having given that some more thought, 11 given the fact that the notice administrator is going to be 12 issuing second round of direct notice by April 14, I am going 13 to order that the parties submit a status report listing those 14 member institutions that have not provided any information 15 responsive to the subpoena on April 15. 16 Anything else that we need to address today? No, your Honor. 17 MS. SPELLMAN: No, your Honor. 18 MS. FEGAN: 19 THE COURT: Thank you very much issues. 20 MS. FEGAN: Thank you. 21 MR. JEFFERSON: Thank you. 22 (Which were all the proceedings heard in this case.) 23 24

25